

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP

B. Trent Webb, Esq.

Eric Buresh, Esq.

2555 Grand Boulevard

Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613

Telephone: (816) 474-6550

Facsimile: (816) 421-5547

bwebb@shb.com

eburesh@shb.com

(pro hac vice applications to be submitted)

Robert H. Reckers, Esq.

600 Travis Street, Suite 1600

Houston, Texas 77002

Telephone: (713) 227-8008

Facsimile: (713) 227-9508

rreckers@shb.com

(pro hac vice application to be submitted)

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

Aaron D. Ford, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 7704)

3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100

Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

Telephone: (702) 784-5200

Facsimile: (702) 784-5252

aford@swlaw.com

RIMINI STREET, INC. and SETH RAVIN

Attorneys for Defendants

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI

Jonathan M. Jacobson, Esq.

1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor

New York, New York, 110019

Telephone: (212) 999-5800

Facsimile: (212) 999-5899

jjacobson@wsgr.com

(pro hac vice applications to be submitted)

Michael B. Levin, Esq.

650 Page Mill Road

Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050

Telephone: (650) 493- 9300

Facsimile: (650) 493 - 6811

mlevin@wsgr.com

(pro hac vice application to be submitted)

GREENBERG TRAURIG

Mark G. Tratos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 1086)

Brandon Roos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 7888)

Leslie Godfrey, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 10229)

3773 Howard Hughes Parkway

Suite 400 North

Las Vegas, NV 89169

Telephone: (702) 792-3773

Facsimile: (702) 792-9002

tratosm@gtlaw.com

roosb@gtlaw.com

godfreyl@gtlaw.com

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;
and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL
CORPORATION, a California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RIMINI STREET, INC. , a Nevada corporation;
SETH RAVIN, an individual,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-PAL

**DEFENDANT SETH RAVIN'S
MOTION TO DISMISS**

DEFENDANT SETH RAVIN'S MOTION TO DISMISS

Defendant Seth Ravin files this Motion to Dismiss each of the Claims for Relief brought against him personally by Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc. ("Oracle USA") and Oracle International Corporation ("OIC") (together "Oracle" or "Plaintiffs") in their Complaint. *See* Doc No. 1 ("Complaint").

I. INTRODUCTION

While Oracle apparently perceives some benefit in personalizing actions against its corporate competitors, when Oracle chooses to take such an approach it must, at a minimum, specify the alleged wrongful acts of the persons so accused. Oracle, however, has not alleged any specific wrongful acts personally performed by Mr. Ravin. Nor has Oracle alleged facts to support any cognizable legal theory under which Mr. Ravin might be liable for the alleged actions of Rimini Street. Oracle's conclusory statements regarding Mr. Ravin are insufficient under *Twombly* and *Iqbal*, and Oracle's claims against him should be dismissed pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6).

II. ARGUMENT**A. Rule 12(b)(6) Standard**

Claims may be dismissed under Rule 12(b)(6) "based on the lack of a cognizable legal theory or the absence of sufficient facts alleged under a cognizable legal theory." *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't.*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988). "A plaintiff's obligation to provide the grounds of his entitlement to relief requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do." *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (internal quotation marks omitted). Although "all allegations of material fact are taken as true and construed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party," *Cahill v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.*, 80 F.3d 336, 337–38 (9th Cir. 1996), a complaint or counterclaim must "raise a right to relief above the speculative level." *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (citations omitted); *see Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct.

1 1937, 1949 (2009) (“[The] complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state
2 a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.”) .

3 **B. Mr. Ravin’s “Authority to Control” Rimini Street**
4 **Does Not Give Rise to Personal Liability.**

5 The only purported conduct by Mr. Ravin alleged in Oracle’s Complaint is that: (1) he is the
6 President and CEO of Rimini Street; and (2) because he “founded and controls” Rimini Street, Mr.
7 Ravin “conspired” with and “aided and abetted” the company. Complaint, paras. 18, 21, 54 and 55.
8 Oracle’s inability to identify any specific acts of wrongful conduct by Mr. Ravin is fatal to its
9 claims.

10 To hold a company official liable for the acts of the company, personal liability must be
11 founded upon specific acts by the individual or, at the very least, be predicated upon a cognizable
12 legal theory for holding the officer liable for the actions of the company. *See Perfect 10, Inc. v. Visa*
13 *Intern. Service Ass’n*, 494 F.3d 788, 808–09 (9th Cir. 2007) (affirming the dismissal with prejudice
14 of plaintiff’s claims for, *inter alia*, unfair competition and interference with prospective economic
15 advantage under the theory of vicarious liability, stating: “Defendants lack sufficient control or
16 personal involvement in the infringing activities to be so liable.”); *Symantec Corp. v. Logical Plus,*
17 *Inc.*, 2009 WL 3416178, *4 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2009); *MDY Indus., LLC v. Blizzard Entm’t, Inc.*,
18 616 F. Supp. 2d 958, 971–72 (D. Ariz. Jan. 28, 2009). Oracle has not attempted to identify such a
19 legal theory or any individual wrongful conduct by Mr. Ravin.¹ Thus, Oracle has not sufficiently
20 alleged any cause of action against Mr. Ravin.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ¹ While an officer is “personally liable for all torts which he authorizes or directs or in which he
28 participates” (*Transgo, Inc. v. Ajac Transmission Parts Corp.*, 768 F.2d 1001, 1021 (9th Cir. 1985)), Oracle has not identified any wrongful actions that Mr. Ravin personally authorized, directed or participated.

1 Instead, Oracle appears to rely on vague allegations of a “conspiracy” between Mr. Ravin
2 and Rimini Street to justify individual liability. Complaint, at para. 22. However, it is well settled
3 that “[a]gents and employees of a corporation cannot conspire with their corporate principal or
4 employer where they act in their official capacities on behalf of the corporation and not as
5 individuals for their individual advantage.” *Doctors’ Co. v. Superior Court*, 49 Cal. 3d 39, 45 (Cal.
6 1989) (emphasis added); see *O’Brien v. Morgan Stanley DW, Inc.*, No. 3:07-CV-00046-LRH-VPC,
7 2008 WL 4224409, at *3 (D. Nev. Sept. 10, 2009); *Collins v. Union Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass’n*, 662
8 P.2d 610, 622 (Nev. 1983); see also *Leve v. Franklin Capital Corp.*, 02 Civ. 2116, 2004 U.S. Dist.
9 LEXIS 11765, at *10 (S.D. N.Y., June 24, 2004); *Shafer v. Berger, Kahn, Shafton, Moss, Figler,*
10 *Simon & Gladstone*, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 777, 800 (Cal. Ct. App. 2003). Because “[a] corporation
11 cannot conspire with itself,” when “a corporate agent acts within the scope of his agency, the acts are
12 attributable to the corporation, not the individual.” *Leve*, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11765, at *10
13 (citing *Black v. Bank of America N.T. & S.A.*, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 725, 729 (Cal. Ct. App. 1995)).
14 Oracle’s conspiracy allegations therefore fail and cannot support Oracle’s claims against Mr. Ravin.
15

16 Furthermore, Oracle cannot establish a conspiracy, aiding and abetting, or alter ego by
17 simply saying that it is so. To successfully plead such bases for liability, a plaintiff must “clearly
18 allege specific action on the part of each defendant that corresponds to the elements of a conspiracy
19 cause of action.” *Accuimage Diagnostics Corp. v. Terarecon, Inc.*, 260 F. Supp. 2d 941, 948 (N.D.
20 Cal. 2003). Plaintiff “cannot indiscriminately allege that conspiracies existed between and among
21 all defendants.” *Id.* But this is precisely what Oracle has done. See Complaint, paras. 21-22. By
22 “indiscriminately alleg[ing] that conspiracies” exist, Oracle’s “claim cannot survive a Rule 12(b)(6)
23 motion.” *Leatt Corp. v. Innovative Safety Technology, LLC*, No. 09cv1301-IEG-POR, 2009 WL
24 2706388, *5 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 24, 2009) (Plaintiffs “only allege Kevin Heath is the owner and
25
26
27
28

1 president of two corporations and their associated websites. Without more, Plaintiffs' alter ego claim
2 cannot survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion."").

3 **C. Oracle has Failed to State a Claim Against Mr. Ravin under *Twombly*.**

4 As set forth in Rimini Street's co-pending Motion to Dismiss, Oracle's Complaint fails to
5 meet the basic pleading standard set forth under *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007) and
6 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937 (2009) as against any defendant. The insufficiencies outlined in
7 Rimini Street's Motion are even more pronounced when applied to Mr. Ravin. While a "plaintiff's
8 obligation to provide the grounds of his entitlement to relief requires more than labels and
9 conclusions" (*Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555), Oracle's Complaint fails to provide any factual basis for
10 imputing personal liability to Mr. Ravin. Having failed to sufficiently plead its allegations, Oracle's
11 claims against Mr. Ravin should be dismissed under *Twombly*.
12

13 In setting forth its numerous claims for relief, Oracle's only specific mention of Mr. Ravin is
14 in connection with its Twelfth Claim for Relief for "unfair practices." See Complaint, para. 152.
15 For this single claim, Oracle states that "Defendant Ravin, as a director, officer or agent of Rimini
16 Street, assisted or aided, directly or indirectly, in the commission of these unfair practices and is
17 equally liable for them." *Id.* This statement, of course, is a perfect example of the "labels and
18 conclusions" that *Twombly* eschews.
19

20 Likewise, for each of the other claims for relief, Oracle's Complaint does not put Mr. Ravin
21 or this Court on notice of which factual allegations, if any, support Oracle's allegations against Mr.
22 Ravin. For example, Oracle has not alleged that Mr. Ravin personally committed any alleged acts of
23 copyright infringement. Regarding Oracle's claimed violations of various computer hacking
24 statutes, Oracle has not alleged that Mr. Ravin personally performed any pertinent acts. Oracle's
25 Complaint also contains no allegation that Mr. Ravin was personally a party to any of the allegedly
26 breached contracts, or that Mr. Ravin personally induced others to breach a contract. Finally, while
27
28

Oracle's Complaint sets forth various causes of actions based in tort, Oracle fails to identify any specific acts of wrongful or tortious conduct by Mr. Ravin. Oracle has failed to assert facts sufficient under *Twombly* to bring any of its causes of action against Mr. Ravin, and has failed to identify a legally cognizable theory supporting imputed liability. Oracle's claims against Mr. Ravin cannot stand. *See Moulton v. City of Sparks*, No. 3:09-cv-00016-BES-VPC, 2009 WL 2407362, *2 (D. Nev. July 28, 2009) (quoting *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't.*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988)). Put simply, Oracle has failed to give Mr. Ravin fair notice of what facts or legal grounds would support holding him personally liable. Oracle's claims against Mr. Ravin should be dismissed pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6).

III. CONCLUSION

In addition to the deficiencies raised in Rimini Street's co-pending Motion to Dismiss, Oracle's Complaint also fails to provide any factual basis for finding Mr. Ravin personally liable. Oracle's claims are without merit, are insufficiently pled, and should be dismissed for failing to meet the standard set forth in *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007) and *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937 (2009).

DATED: March __, 2010

GREENBERG TRAURIG

By: /s/ Leslie S. Godfrey
 Mark G. Tratos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 1086)
 Brandon Roos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 7888)
 Leslie Godfrey, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 10229)
 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway
 Suite 400 North
 Las Vegas, NV 89169
 Attorney for Defendants
 Rimini Street, Inc. and Seth Ravin

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the ___th day of March, 2010, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the clerk of the court for the U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, using the electronic case filing system. The electronic case filing system sent a "Notice of Electronic Filing" to the attorneys of record who have consented in writing to accept this Notice as service of this document by electronic means.

By: /s/: Leslie S. Godfrey
Leslie Godfrey, Esq.
Attorney for Defendants
Rimini Street, Inc. and Seth Ravin